DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 461 EA 014 645

AUTHOR Kraemer, Kenneth L.; Perry, James L.
TITLE Camelot Revisited: Public Administration Education in a Generic School. Management Research Program.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Irvine. Graduate School of Administration.; California Univ., Irvine. Public Policy Research Organization.
REPORT NO GSA/PPRO-WP-80-104
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on Teaching Public Administration (3rd, Olympia, WA, May 30-31, 1980).
AVAILABLE FROM Public Policy Research Organization, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA 92717 ($4.50).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Administration Education; Educational Objectives; Educational Theories; Higher Education; Public Administration; *Public Administration Education; *School Organization

ABSTRACT

The belief that the similarities between business administration and public administration are more significant than the differences led in the 1950s to the development of schools teaching administration as a generic process. This paper reassesses eight tenets underlying the generic model for administrative education, drawn from the work of early advocates and developers of the concept. Directed toward both the nature of the concept and its implementation, these eight tenets hold that (1) significant phenomena and problems are common to the many fields of administration; (2) a common body of knowledge and methodological approach exists; (3) many administrators will work in the business, government, and education sectors in various combinations during their careers, and can be trained in all simultaneously; (4) the allocation of faculty resources is based on the programmatic integrity of both the core and the institutional areas; (5) recruitment of students and placement of graduates need not be differentiated among client groups; (6) the academic experience facilitates preparation for private and public management equally; (7) the commonalities of the generic ideal can overcome traditionally differentiating forces in the university environment; and (8) generic schools are efficient vehicles for education in public and private management. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216461

MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kenneth L. Kraemer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 014 645

GSA
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ADMINISTRATION

ppro
PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

The Management Research Program is a joint activity of the Graduate School of Administration and the Public Policy Research Organization, University of California, Irvine. Its mission is to foster the initiation, conduct and utilization of research on management issues and problems in organizations of all types—business, government, education, health and others.

The Management Research Program's role is similar to that of other university research organizations which assist professionals in fields such as engineering, agriculture and medicine. It is in a unique position to assist managers by providing intellectual support through its research, through conducting multi-client studies on issues of joint interest, and through sharing the expertise of its affiliated faculty and staff.

The Management Research Program draws its faculty researchers from the Graduate School of Administration. The faculty research interests and expertise cover areas such as management science and operations research, organizational behavior and development, managerial accounting and finance, labor relations and personnel, management information and control systems, business strategy and policy, and public policy-making and implementation.

For further information, please write:

Management Research Program
Room 611, Administration Building
University of California
Irvine, CA 92717

714/833-7117

CAMELOT REVISITED:
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION EDUCATION IN A GENERIC SCHOOL

Kenneth L. Kraemer and James L. Perry*

March 1980
WP-80-104

Graduate School of Administration
and
Public Policy Research Organization
University of California
Irvine, CA 92717

Paper prepared for presentation at the Third National Conference on Teaching Public Administration, Olympia, Washington, May 30-31, 1980

CAMELOT REVISITED:
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION EDUCATION IN A GENERIC SCHOOL

INTRODUCTION

The concept of administration as a generic process, applicable equally to the business and public sectors, first received concrete expression in the fifties with the creation of the School of Business and Public Administration and the Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ) at Cornell University.[1] Surprisingly, it continues to have great appeal today, despite the lack of any systematic empirical research that verifies the fundamental proposition of the concept. Simply put, this proposition is that there are substantial commonalities in administrative processes among institutional settings, and that these commonalities are more significant than the differences.

This proposition derived from a common perception, especially among academic disciplines (rather than among professional schools involved in administrative education), that then emerging concepts of human relations, communications, operations research, statistical decision theory, and behavioral science were as applicable to a hospital as to a bank, to a department store as to a governmental bureau. As evidence for this perception, the advocates of generic administration cited the continuous movement of managerial personnel from business to government and vice versa, and the remarkable success of management consulting firms working in the multiple fields of business, government, education, health and the military.

These perceptions form the basis for past and current advocacy of the generic approach to education for administration. The generic model is based upon a related set of tenets about professional careers, the state

of knowledge about administration, the transferability of administrative tools and techniques, and the suitability of a single academic vehicle for delivering knowledge and skills. The model starts with the observation that administrators in business and government (or health and education, etc.) have shifted increasingly from one sector to another during their professional careers. It is reinforced by the perception in academic circles that there exists a body of knowledge about management and organizations and a set of tools and techniques that are common to the business and government sectors. Therefore, knowledge and skills can be packaged and delivered through a single academic vehicle that will prepare students to function in either business or government. And, because they emphasize the commonalities, such generic schools will be "efficient" vehicles for education in business and public management.[2]

The generic model for administrative education is intuitively appealing. For faculty, it expresses a belief in the possibility of developing an administrative science and a conviction that progress is being made and will continue.[3] Thus, administration is elevated above other professional fields by virtue of its prospects for becoming a science in its own right and thereby gaining standing and respect for its "professors" within the university. For university administrators, it allows innovation and economy. Large, established universities can achieve modest economies, along with an image of being innovative, by converting their business and public administration schools to "management schools". Smaller, newer universities can still aspire to, and maintain the image of, "multiversity," with a small, independent, generic faculty or a jointly-appointed faculty in the social sciences and applied mathematics. For students, the generic model provides apparent maximum flexibility for career development,

choice, and mobility, not only in their initial jobs but throughout their professional life.

Given the intuitive appeal of the generic model, one might have expected substantial growth in the number of schools of administration. Yet, the absolute number of public administration programs in generic schools is a small proportion (10-15 percent) of all public administration programs.[4] Moreover, the generic model itself has taken several different forms of expression:

1. The schools of administration: "generic from their inception; explicitly committed to the generic model in their self-concept and advertising; offer a single master's degree in "administration"; illustrated by U.C. Irvine, U.C. Riverside, Willamette and, to some extent, Yale.

2. The combined schools of business and public administration: combined from inception or subsequently; committed to a common core, but emphasize the institutional sectors; offer separate degrees for the business and public sectors; illustrated by Cornell, Ohio State, University of Arizona, University of Alaska, and University of Missouri, Kansas City.

3. The management schools: essentially business schools; committed to the notion that public management is an extension of sound business; offer a public management option within the MBA or MM degrees; illustrated by Stanford, UCLA, and Northwestern.

This diversity among the relatively small number of generic schools, makes it difficult to assess the generic concept or the practical problems of implementing the concept. Nevertheless, decisions to establish generic schools or to convert existing independent programs to generic schools should be made with consideration of both the conceptual and practical problems inherent in such schools. Consequently, we decided to focus on examining the most generic schools--the schools of administration. They provide an excellent base for assessing the generic ideal; they provide a basis for developing insights into the conceptual and practical problems of the combined schools and the management schools; and, they have been discussed and written about sufficiently to provide both a theoretical and experimental record useful to an assessment. Moreover, we know a great deal about them, having eighteen years of collective experience in a school of administration.

ASSESSMENT OF THE TENETS OF THE GENERIC MODEL

In order to conduct our assessment, we isolated eight tenets of the generic model for administrative education. We drew these tenets from the early advocates and developers of the idea, such as James D. Thompson, Edward Litchfield, and Ivan Hinderaker. Each tenet is discussed next.

1. <u>There are significant phenomena and problems common to the many fields of administration</u>. At some level, it is clear that there are a set of general management functions common to business and public administration, whether these functions are summarized by Gulick's acronym POSDCORB, or any of a half dozen other such lists. But, it is equally clear that these functions, which bear identical labels, take on different meanings in public and private settings. This fact is attested to not only by the

nearly unanimous conclusions of individuals who have been general managers in both business and government, but also by the growing number of empirical case studies of what managers do.[5] Moreover, although limited, the literature comparing public and private organizations provides additional support for this conclusion.[6] In fact, the evidence has been viewed as sufficiently compelling by some scholars and administrators to conclude that public and private management are common only in their unimportant respects.[7]

The most compelling argument for the conclusion that the differences are more important than the similarities, and the factor underlying many of the public-private distinctions, is a fundamental constitutional difference. For example, Allison notes that "the general management functions concentrated in the CEO of a private business are, by constitutional design, spread in the public sector among a number of competing institutions and thus shared by a number of individuals whose ambitions are set against one another."[8] There is also a difference in the functional role of business and government in society. Not only is government set up to do things which business cannot do, or will not do, but government also is a rule maker for business which frequently brings the two institutions into fundamental conflict.[9]

2. A body of knowledge and set of tools and techniques exists that is common to the fields of administration. Beginning with the assumption that there are phenomena and problems common to the fields of administration, it seems reasonable to apply the knowledge and techniques derived from an understanding of these phenomena and problems to the management of organizations in a variety of contexts.

The persuasiveness of this reasoning diminishes when one realizes the limited applicability of much of the administrative sciences to management practice. In a critique of the artificiality of much administrative research, Mintzberg notes:

> Organizations intermingle a great many elements in their functioning. Researchers who focus on two variables at a time--who catch what someone has called "the economists' plague": holding all other things constant--seem to cloud issues almost as often as clarify them,...We shall never have closure so long as we pretend that other things can be held constant. We live in a world of dynamic systems.[10]

Furthermore, the predominant body of knowledge that does exist about administration tends to be derived from research about, and oriented towards, the instrumental needs of the business sector, and its value set, and not the instrumental needs of the public sector, and its value set. Consequently, the research that is frequently presented as generic in textbooks on organization and management inherently is knowledge about business administration rather than about business and public administration, or about administration per se.[11]

Given these problems and difficulties with research, it is not surprising that the "core curriculum" or "basic requirements" are inconsistent across the schools that we have defined to be generic. Among the eight generic schools shown in Table 1, there is a total of 30 different courses comprising the common core or basic requirements for a master's degree. There is also considerable variety regarding the number of courses comprising the common core, with as few as five at Cornell and as many as eighteen at Willamette. There is substantial agreement among the eight schools only with regard to eight courses: quantitative methods, statistics, microeconomics, macroeconomics, managerial accounting, managerial finance, micro-organization theory and macro-organization theory. Generally, there

is somewhat greater agreement on the common core among the schools which started out as generic than there is between these and the schools which started out as business schools and converted to the generic. To illustrate the extreme, Stanford University defines the public administration core as the business administration core plus two additional courses on "public sector economics" and " the political process".[12]

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Table 1 reflects a substantial amount of disagreement about the commonality of administrative tools and techniques. Some skill based courses, such as personnel, operations research, interpersonal dynamics, and marketing, are required core courses at no more than three of the eight schools. Even those tool courses about which there is more substantial consensus, like accounting and finance, are commonly viewed quite differently by their respective practitioners in government and business.

3. Many administrators will work in some combination of business, government and educational sectors during their careers and they can be educated simultaneously to perform in each of these institutional sectors. This tenet of the generic model grew out of an optimistic view of future organizational mobility that developed in the late 1950s and early 1960s. As Edward Litchfield wrote in the essay marking the inauguration of the ASQ: "The constant movement of executive personnel from business to government, from the military forces into large business, from both government and business into education is emphatic testimony supporting our conviction that knowledges and skills are transferable from field to field to field because of an essential universality in the administrative process itself."[13]

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF THE CORE CURRICULUM IN ILLUSTRATIVE GENERIC SCHOOLS[1]

CORE/BASIC REQUIREMENTS	GENERIC SCHOOLS							
	UC Irvine	Willamette[4]	UC Riverside	Yale	Cornell[3]	Northwestern	UC Los Angeles	Stanford
Quantitative Methods for Administration	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Statistics for Administration	X	X		X		X		X
Microeconomics	X	X				X	X	X
Macroeconomics	X	X		X	X	X		X
Accounting information for Management	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Managerial finance	X	X	X	X	*	X	X	
Macro-Organization theories and models	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Micro-Organization theories and models	X	X	X	X		X		
Interpersonal dynamics	X	X	X					
Human resources and labor relations	X		X				X	
Workshop in admin. problem solving	X			X				
Institutional arena I (business, public, health, education)[2]	X			X	X			X
" " II	X	X		X	*			X
" " III				X				
Computer lab/Intro. to computing					X			
Marketing management				X	*		X	X
Operations and production management				X	*		X	
Operations research		X						X
Budget and control systems		X						
Organizations and their environments		X						
Organizational design		X						
Government		X						
Legal processes		X						
Business, government and society		X	X					X
Political analysis for management				X				
Intro. to management information systems							X	X
Business finance								X
Business policy							X	X
Public sector economics								X
The political process								X
Data analysis							X	X

[1]The data for this table are drawn from the official brochures for each of the schools for 1979-80.

[2]Usually focus on the policy-making process, policy analysis, and substantive policy issues in business, government, health, education or other institutional arenas.

[3]Cornell officially defines only five courses in the common core but actually has seven courses since (macro-organization theories and models and an institutional arena policy course) are additional common core requirements of the business and public administration curricula. In addition, the business curriculum has further basic requirements indicated by the asterisks above.

[4]Some of the courses listed here are one credit quarter courses.

This assertion of almost constant movement of executive personnel across the business and public sectors does not appear to have been borne out by the experience of the last two decades. For example, the President's Reorganization Project indicated that the federal government has been a relatively static organization in terms of lateral personnel movement between executive agencies.[14] And the mobility that occurs does not reflect widespread opportunities for managers to move easily from one sector to another. Admittedly, businessmen move to the federal government, but such entry is ordinarily confined to the upper echelons of the federal service, which comprise something less than seven thousand employee.[15] Even at this level, many of the people moving in and out of government are trained in the legal, rather than the administrative or management, profession. The relatively minor volume of movement that occurs at other levels in the federal service, as Derek Bok indicates, is confined generally to specialists, that is, lawyers in the Justice Department, physicians in the Public Health Service, and engineers in the Department of Transportation.[16]

Even if significant numbers of general managers did move across institutional boundaries, it does not necessarily follow that the generic curriculum would be of any significant value to a manager making the move across sectors. First, managers are usually recruited from business to government because of their demonstrated values and accomplishments in the business sector (or vice versa). Thus, business managers enter government to "bring the business perspective" or to "make it more businesslike", not to transform it according to some general principles of management. Second, since many managers will not shift the locus of their careers for many years following their completion of formal education, a question

arises about the practical linkage between the generic educational preparation and its subsequent application.

4. Decisions about the allocation of faculty resources are based on programmatic integrity of both the core and the institutional areas. Whereas the previous three tenets dealt with the generic school concept, this tenet and those which follow deal with implementation of the concept. This tenet is based on the notion that the generic school should reflect both the institutional sectors as well as the common core.[17] This breadth was considered critical to meeting the credibility requirements of existing professional clientele (e.g., practitioner community, accreditation boards, business and government recruiters, etc.).

Despite an interest within generic schools for attending to "credibility" with external clientele groups, programmatic integrity is difficult to develop and maintain. First, because of the large number of administrative areas to be represented, it is difficult to achieve a critical mass of faculty in any single area, especially in the smaller schools (less than 25 full time faculty). Second, it is especially difficult to achieve and retain a critical mass of faculty in public administration in the face of differential student demand. In most public educational institutions the primary criterion for allocation of existing or new faculty positions is student demand, as measured by student full-time equivalents (FTE). The disadvantage of public administration in a generic school is that given the larger market for business skills, the FTE advantage quite naturally falls on the business side of the ledger. For example, the current ratio of business to public administration students in generic schools is typically about 6 to 1. The resultant tension between programmatic integrity and student demand naturally creates internal tensions among faculty

assigned to the various curricular foci and difficulties for maintaining the integrity of various programmatic elements, especially public administration. The resolution of these tensions has traditionally been to the detriment of public administration more than any other component of the generic program.[18] This is illustrated by the reported decline or difficulties of public administration programs at Cornell and Northwestern.[19]

5. Recruitment of students and placement of graduates, like other aspects, are generic functions of the program and do not need to be differentiated among client groups. This tenet is called into question when one considers the dominance of business-oriented students within a generic school. Job market factors favor student recruitment into the business-oriented components of the school. Therefore, in order to maintain balance, it might be necessary to specially recruit public-oriented students and/or to limit the business-oriented students.

Although the issue of recruitment is a serious one, the placement problems that a generic school confronts may be more serious. All generic school students are confronted with the need to explain their educational preparation to prospective employers, but the job-finding problems for public administration-oriented students are especially acute. Jan Orloff and Michael Murray, both experienced administrators of public management programs in generic schools, have catalogued the relatively greater difficulties of finding employment in the public as compared to the private sector.[20] As Murray writes, "unlike business firms which blanket the campus, few government agencies do on-campus recruiting. The public administration graduate must seek out the employer. Also, the contact of job candidates is usually with the personnel officer, who has no individual authority to hire. In most cases he in turn must relate to the top political executive

who makes this decision."[21] Not only does the external job search network prove to be more difficult for students seeking employment in the public sector, but as Murray writes, "public sector students find themselves ipso facto in competition for status with their business student counterparts. Typically, public administration students are offered anywhere from $2000 to $5000 less for starting positions. The blow to the students' self-worth can be devastating."[22]

These experiences clearly suggest that without special attention to the locus of student placement, generic schools would place very few students in the public service, but many students in business. This differential is not the fault of the generic schools; rather it is as we suggest above, attributable to current recruitment and pay practices in the public sector. Indeed, from a broad economy-wide perspective, the differential placement of students is not particularly serious since the labor market allocates sufficient personnel to the business and government sectors. However, from the perspective of the generic school, the absence of key placements in the public service has a continuing detrimental effect on the ability of the school to maintain internal balance, especially within the student body. Graduating students often look to the job roles taken by prior graduates as a cue for their own job search behavior. Similarly, entering students look to these job roles as a cue to their selection of the business or public sector concentration. The absence of public sector role models, therefore, can seriously impair the future probability of both recruiting and placing students in the public sector.

6. The ambience or culture of the academic experience facilitates equally preparation for public and private management. In theory, the impact of the generic curriculum upon the career choices, values, or inclinations

of the students who experience it should be neutral. In fact, it may be quite different. Lyman Porter, Dean of the Graduate School of Administration at U.C. Irvine, has noted that most students who come to Irvine "undecided about careers" eventually turn to the private sector.[23] Yale has recently had an even more startling experience. The first class recruited to its new School of Organization and Management was equally divided between public and private sector students. However, only ten percent of the first graduating class was placed in the public sector.[24]

Among the reasons for this phenomenon may be that the values of those students who select generic schools are not representative of those who are likely to enter the public service. They are more likely to emphasize economic over service values or, at best, in the case of the "undecided's," to weight them equally. Thus, the generic school may simply attract a quite different population of students than public administration schools, and the internal climate may not be significantly different from other schools teaching some type of management or administration.

However, internal dynamics also appear to be at work. Among these is the tendency of the core faculty, which comprises about half the faculty in most generic programs, to have a substantial business bias. This bias is often not overt or intentional, but it is real nevertheless. And, it is an outgrowth of three mutually reinforcing tendencies: (1) the large number of business-oriented students who demand business relevance in core classes; (2) the large number of faculty (e.g., economists, organizational behaviorists, financial analysts, etc.) who, although teaching in a generic school, received their doctoral education and/or spent their early academic careers in predominantly business-oriented programs; and (3), an inadequate research base about public organizations that often

requires faculty to draw upon material for teaching that is focused predominantly on business organizations.

Another aspect of the ambience within a generic school is more subtle; it involves the perception of the curriculum by the students themselves. Many students perceive the curriculum in terms of their interests, which are defined along traditional lines, i.e., business or government. For these students, the generic concept is not particularly meaningful. They simply filter the curriculum through their perceptions and interests, both in the common core, and in the advanced curriculum. A related aspect of these perceptions is the antipathy of business-oriented students for the public sector. For these students, value differences between the public and private sectors are not easily tolerated. And this is frequently reflected in their day-to-day interactions with their peers who are interested in the public sector. Thus, as Murray and others conclude, public sector students suffer from the "second class citizen syndrome" in generic schools.[25]

7. The integrating commonalities of the generic ideal are sufficient to overcome traditional differentiating forces within the university environment. Personal commitment or socialization to the generic ideal, team-teaching in the core courses, and "integration" courses (e.g., workshops in problem solving, business-government interface, comparative public-private management) are the devices the generic school advocates and uses to integrate a diverse faculty.

So long as the generic school is small, there is considerable reinforcement of integration efforts. However, as the school grows, several forces favor differentiation and fractionation. The division of labor that accompanies growth reduces the use of team-teaching and other integrative

devices, thereby permitting the fractionation of the faculty. Furthermore, growth allows the development of "critical masses" or clusters of faculty in specialized areas. While this clustering of faculty might be desirable, it allows faculty within the clusters to focus more exclusively on their specialized interests, to the exclusion of common interests with other colleagues.

The dominant differentiating force in the generic school, however, is the allegiance of the "core faculty" to their disciplines rather than to administration. These disciplines usually include economics, statistics, operations research, sociology, and psychology. The discipline-oriented faculty tend to be less interested in professional activity and distrust their colleagues who show an interest in the professional side of administration. They also tend to view themselves as at the cutting edge of research in their field (though not in administration) and view the faculty in the institutional arenas of business and public administration as practitioners, especially if their research happens to be focused within their arena. Finally, by virtue of their numbers within the school and their fit with the discipline orientation of the whole university, the discipline-oriented faculty tend to set the standards for promotions and rewards within the school. Publication in the top-rated business or public administration journals may come to be viewed less highly than publication in the Administrative Science Quarterly (run by sociologists) or any of the purely disciplinary journals (e.g., Psychological Bulletin, American Sociological Review, American Economic Review, Operations Research, etc.). Moreover, publication in purely practitioner journals diminishes one's reputation as a scholar in the eyes of the discipline-oriented faculty. The standards applied to publication also are applied to other areas of faculty life

such as conference attendance, professional activity, consulting, and public service.

The net result is that faculty who are not aligned with the core disciplines face greater pressure in gaining acceptance by their colleagues and in achieving promotion and advancement within the school. They also face the additional pressure of being the sole representatives of the school to the practitioner and professional communities which are the school's clients. In order to cope with these multiple demands, they must specialize and focus their activity even more, thus enlarging the gulf between the core faculty and the arena-specific faculties.

8. Generic schools are efficient vehicles for education in public and private management. The idea is that instead of having to duplicate department administrators, support staff and facilities in independent business and public schools, central academic administrators are able to achieve economies of scale and reduce the resource expenditure in the core areas, reduce the time he/she would otherwise spend with independent department administrators, and have the additional benefit of being on the forefront of innovative management education.

A problem with this tenet of the model, however, is that it ignores possible underutilization of subsets of faculty within the generic aggregate. For example, the student orientation and ambience problems we discussed earlier suggest that PA faculty within generic schools will tend to be underutilized because student-faculty ratios for them will be less than for colleagues inside the school (or for colleagues located in PA programs outside the school).

Generic schools also tend to encounter faculty allocation inefficiencies not experienced at single sector schools. The larger the number of

core areas, institutional arenas and concentrations, the greater the difficulty of achieving a critical mass of faculty in any of them and the greater the difficulty of dividing up future faculty resources. It has been our experience that the generic school results in a proliferation rather than a concentration of faculty disciplines and specialities because of a simple political fact--it is far easier to agree on adding some new speciality to the faculty, which benefits no particular existing faculty group explicitly, than to add strength in an existing discipline or speciality where there is obvious benefit to one faculty cluster and not to others. It is simply easier to get agreement on priorities for faculty recruitment in which no one gains than it is to get agreement for priorities for which some individuals gain more than others.

This fractionation creates another problem in universities where research is important. The problem is that there is a serious conflict between the critical mass required for teaching and that required for excellence in research. Whereas teaching demands and the politics of recruitment-priority-setting combine to fractionate and proliferate the faculty, excellence in research requires the concentration of faculty in a few speciality areas (where the school will seek to achieve distinction) and the use of lecturers to meet some teaching needs. Yet, the very structure of the generic school works against obtaining agreement on the research concentrations and therefore on a faculty recruitment policy which would strengthen the concentrations. The result is that not a single generic school has achieved a national reputation for excellence in research different from any traditional business or public administration school.

CONCLUSION

Through our assessment of eight tenets underlying the generic approach to administrative education, we have presented a picture of the difficulties confronting education for the public service in such contexts. Our critical assessment in no way reflects upon the overall quality of education offered by generic schools. We believe, that they are generally superior to many exclusively PA programs in certain regards. For example, generic schools clearly offer greater technical and quantitative preparation, direct interaction of business and public sector faculty and students, and confrontation of values. But, generic schools will continue to struggle to attract, develop and place even small numbers of public managers whose technical and normative preparations for public service are equally strong.

We also believe that the success of the generic approach depends upon strategies and resources for dealing with the problems we have discussed in this paper. As a prelude to developing such strategies, however, it will be necessary for university and academic administrators to formulate more realistic philosohpical and operational underpinnings for such programs. For instance, our arguments above suggest that generic schools should be viewed as different, but not more efficient, ways for organizing resources for public and private administrative education. Generic schools also need to better design their curricula to deal with the differences as well as the similarities in the institutional sectors, especially with regard to core knowledge and techniques. Finally, generic schools need to reconsider how actual rather than ideal patterns of managerial mobility across the sectors should be related, if at all, to the curriculum design. For example, current and future limitations on job mobility across sectors

might lead to structuring relatively more courses around the institutional sectors rather than the core areas (e.g., business and public finance rather than "finance"). These types of changes in basic assumptions will facilitate implementation of the generic approach.

Many explicit changes could, of course, also be derived from our comments about problems of implementing the generic approach. A prerequisite to these changes is to select faculty and administrators who have the broad perspective that is necessary for successfully implementing the generic concent. This is an important step for assuring a climate in which preparation for entry into public administration is a viable student choice. As a means for assuring the programmatic integrity of public administration and other concentrations, a generic school could develop a charter that enunciates clearly minimum and expected staffing levels in PA and other areas. Such a charter would also serve to prevent the proliferation of faculty specializations. Student recruitment and selection should attempt to achieve a balance of students interested in the various institutional areas. This balance among the interests of students drawn to the program must be reinforced by a curriculum and organizational climate conducive to a student's development and an awareness of his/her values. Generic schools need to give special attention to the placement of students into government organizations. It is especially important that public sector role models (e.g., the Presidential Management Intern Program) be provided for students who are leaning toward or undecided about entering the public sector. Instructional resources, for teaching aids and faculty assistance, must be made available to guarantee that the "common" curriculum is truly generic. Finally, faculty evaluation criteria must be broad enough to accommodate fairly the contributions of both discipline-oriented and professionally-oriented faculty.

FOOTNOTES

*Authorship is alphabetical to denote equal contribution. We gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments of Garth Jones, Charles Levine, Lyman Porter, and Judy Rosener.

1. See: James D. Thompson, "Editorial", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1:1 (June, 1956), 1-2.

2. This particluar formulation of the generic model is our own. However, it is based upon statements in the following classic articles dealing with education for administration: Edward H. Litchfield, "Notes on general theory of administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1:1 (June, 1956), 3-29; Ivan Hinderaker, "The study of administration: interdisciplinary dimensions", Western Political Quarterly, 16:3 (September, 1963), 5-12. To some extent, several of these ideas can even be traced back to the classic essay by Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration," Political Science Quarterly, 2:2 (June, 1887), 197-220.

3. Thompson, op. cit., used this phrase to characterize the philosophy behind the ASQ.

4. For example, Fritschler and Mackelprang identified 13 programs in which public affairs/administration was combined with business out of a total of 156 public affairs/administration programs. (Our own examination of their data identified 22 such combined programs, or 14 percent of the total.) In addition, they indicate that growth in the number of combined programs has declined since the early seventies. See Table 1

in A. Lee Fritschler and A. J. Mackelprang, 1978 Directory, Programs in Public Affairs and Administration. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, 1978, p.iv.

5. See, for example: "Candid Reflections of a Businessman in Washington," Fortune, January 29, 1979 (Michael Blumenthal); "A Politician Turned Executive," Fortune, September 10, 1979 (Donald Rumsfeld); and A. J. Cervantes, "Memoirs of A Businessman - Mayor," Business Week, December 8, 1973.

6. For a thorough review of this literature see Hal G. Rainey, Robert W. Backoff, and Charles H. Levine, "Comparing Public and Private Organizations," Public Administration Review, 36 (March/April 1976), 233-244.

7. For example, Wallace Sayre; and, more recently, Graham Allison. See Graham W. Allison, "Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects?" In Proceedings of the Public Management Research Conference. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1980, pp. 27-38.

8. Ibid, p. 33.

9. Fremont James Lyden, "Using Parson's Functional Analysis in the Study of Public Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 20 (March 1975), 59-70.

10. Henry Mintzberg, "An Emerging Strategy of "Direct" Research, Administrative Science Quarterly, 24 (December 1979), 582-589 at p.588.

11. Rainey, Bachoff and Levine, op. cit.

12. Graduate School of Business, The MBA Experience. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, undated, p.7.

13. Litchfield, op. cit., p.8.

14. The President's Reorganization Project (1977). Personnel Management Project, Volumes 1-3. Washington, D.C.: Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President.

15. The group that we are considering here is roughly equivalent in size to the Senior Executive Service.

16. Derek C. Bok, The President's Report, 1973-74. Cambridge, MA: Office of the Governing Boards, Harvard University. Bok's subsequent report is an interesting reaffirmation of the distinctness of business administration. See: Derek C. Bok, The President's Report, 1977-78. Cambridge, MA: Office of the President, Harvard University, 1979.

17. See Note 2 above.

18. Teaching demand easily helps to sustain the comon core faculty since they serve both business and public sector students. Although some core specialities might be below critical mass at any single point in time, they are reasonably assured of attaining and retaining critical mass faculty so long as growth occurs in the school as a whole. Moreover, in the face of a limited public sector market, they are likely to push for increased growth in the business sector because this enhances their own chances for growth. The net effect of an enlarged core faculty along with growth in the business faculty, is to diminish the relative role of the public sector faculty in school decision making.

19. Based on conversations with colleagues at these schools.

20. Michael A. Murray. "Strategies for placing public administration graduates", Public Administration Review, 35:6, (November-December, 1975), 629-635. Jan Orloff, "Public management program graduates; public or private sector bound?" Civil Service Journal, 19 (July-September, 1978), 14-17.

21. Murray, op. cit., pp. 629-630.

22. Ibid, p. 630.

23. Reported in the summary of a panel discussion on "Attracting Quality Candidates to a Public Service Under Fire" at the Public Service Careers Conference, September 12, 1978, Airport Marina Hotel, Los Angeles, CA, and attached to a letter dated October 20, 1978, from Donald M. Robbins, Regional Recruitment Manager, U.S. Civil Service Commission, to the conference participants.

24. Personal communication with faculty colleagues at the School of Organization and Management, Yale University. This trend has continued although in altered form. The more recent reported mix of students on entry is 40/40/20 in business, public administration, and not-for-profit or uncommitted, respectively. The job mix of exiting graduates is 80/20 in business and public administration, respectively, "counting the most favorable way possible for public administration."

25. Murray, op. cit.